



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR    | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/579,256      | 05/25/2000  | Umesh Gopaldas Khatwani | AUS000195US1        | 7212             |

35525 7590 10/05/2006

IBM CORP (YA)  
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC  
P.O. BOX 802333  
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

BOTTS, MICHAEL K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                                      |  |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>09/579,256 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>KHATWANI ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Michael K. Botts  | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2176                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-17, 19-25, 27-37 and 39-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-17, 19-25, 27-37, and 39-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign\*priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This document is a Final Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive to the following communications: Response to Office Action, which was filed on July 24, 2006.
2. Claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-25, 27-37, and 39-70 are currently pending in the case, with claims 1, 13, 32, 47, 48, 53, 60, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, and 70 being the independent claims.
3. Claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-25, 27-37, and 39-70 are rejected.

### ***Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 13-16, 19-24, 27-31, 53-55, 57, 58, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Imielinski et al., (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0013792 A1, with priority to U.S. Provisional Application 60/173,757, which was filed on December 30, 1999) [hereinafter "Imielinski"].**

Regarding **independent claims 13, 53, and 66:**

Imielinski discloses receiving a first web document in fig. 1 and paragraphs (0036) – (0040). The first web document is called the original electronic document in Imielinski. Imielinski teaches receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs (0049) - (0054), and (0067). Imielinski also provides an example in paragraph (0014) that virtual tags, for example, could be used to display text of the original document in a red font on the virtual page. Imielinski discloses creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document wherein the font attribute, within the second web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs (0036) – (0040), and paragraphs (0042) - (0048). In Imielinski, the second web document is called the virtual page. The virtual page is the requested portion of the original electronic document that selected and customized according to the transformation rules generated by the user. See also Response to Arguments, made applicable herein by this reference.

Regarding **dependent claims 14 and 54:**

Imielinski discloses wherein the step of creating the second web document includes inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion

Art Unit: 2176

in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs (0049) - (0054), and (0067). Imielinski also provides an example in paragraph (0014) that virtual tags, for example, could be used to display the selected text of the original document in a red font on the virtual page.

Regarding **dependent claim 15**:

Imielinski discloses sending the second web document to an output device in fig. and paragraphs (0042) - (0048).

Regarding **dependent claims 16 and 55**:

Imielinski discloses wherein the output device is a display device in fig. 3 and paragraphs (0042) - (0048). Imielinski discloses wherein the selected portion is displayed according to the virtual font indicators in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs (0049) - (0054), and (0067).

Regarding **dependent claim 19**:

Imielinski discloses wherein the virtual font indicators include tags in fig. 1-3 and paragraph (0036) - (0048).

Regarding **dependent claim 20**:

Imielinski discloses wherein the markup language is hypertext markup language in paragraphs (0011) and (0015).

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding **dependent claim 21**, Imielinski discloses wherein the virtual font indicators include hypertext markup language tags in fig. 1-3 and paragraph (0036) - (0048).

Regarding **dependent claims 22 and 57**:

Imielinski discloses identifying at least one font indicator associated with text within the selected portion of the first web document, wherein the step of creating the second web document includes modifying the font attribute of the associated at least one font indicator in fig. 9B and paragraph (0067).

Regarding **dependent claim 23**:

Imielinski discloses sending the second web document to an output device in fig. 3 and paragraphs (0042) - (0048).

Regarding **dependent claims 24 and 58**:

Imielinski discloses wherein the output device is a display device in fig. and paragraphs (0042) - (0048). Imielinski discloses wherein the selected portion is displayed according to the virtual font indicators in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs (0049) - (0054), and (0067).

Regarding **dependent claim 27**:

Imielinski discloses wherein the at least one font indicator includes a tag in fig. 1-3 and paragraph (0036) - (0048).

Regarding **dependent claim 28**:

Imielinski discloses wherein the markup language is hypertext markup language in paragraphs (0011) and (0015).

Regarding **dependent claim 29**:

Imielinski discloses wherein the at least one font indicator includes a hypertext markup language tag in paragraphs (0011) and (0015).

Regarding **dependent claim 30**:

Imielinski discloses creating a copy of the first web document and changing the font attribute of the selected portion within the copy of the first web document in fig. 9B and paragraph (0067). The original document appearing on the user's display is copied and changed, which is the copy. The original document, residing on the server, is not changed.

Regarding **dependent claim 31**:

Imielinski discloses changing the font attribute of the selected portion within the first web document to create the second web document in fig. 9A and paragraph (0066).

**5. Claims 1-7, 9-12, 17, 25, 32-37, 39-48, 51, 52, 56, 59-65, and 67-70 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imielinski et al., (U.S.**

**Patent Application Publication 2002/0013792 A1, with priority to U.S. Provisional Application 60/173,757, which was filed on December 30, 1999) [hereinafter "Imielinski"], and further in view of Batres (U.S. Patent 6,832,351 B1, filed October 1, 1999) [hereinafter "Batres"].**

Regarding **independent claims 1, 48, and 65:**

Imielinski teaches receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document in fig. 1 and paragraphs (0036) - (0040). The first web document is called the original electronic document in Imielinski. Imielinski teaches receiving a request to present a selected portion of the first web document in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs (0036) - (0040), and paragraphs (0042) - (0048). The request and selected portion are defined in the transformation information of Imielinski.

Imielinski teaches identifying formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document and creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs (0036) - (0040), and paragraphs (0042) - (0048). In Imielinski the second web document is called the virtual page. The virtual page is the requested portion of the original electronic document that selected and customized according to the transformation rules generated by the user. Imielinski teaches responsive to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion, inserting virtual font indicators before



Art Unit: 2176

and after text within the selected portion in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs (0049) - (0054), and (0067). Imielinski also provides an example in paragraph (0014) that virtual tags, for example, could be used to display text of the original document in a red font on the virtual page. Imielinski does not teach responsive to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion, inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

**Regarding dependent claim 2:**

Imielinski teaches sending the second web document to an output device in fig. 3 and paragraphs (0042) – (0048).

**Regarding dependent claim 3:**

Imielinski does not teach wherein the output device is a printer.

Batres does wherein the output device is a printer in the abstract, col. 1 line 62 - col. 2 line 9, and col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

**Regarding dependent claim 4:**

Imielinski teaches wherein the output device is a display device in fig. 3 and paragraphs (0042) - (0048).

**Regarding dependent claims 5 and 51:**

Imielinśki teaches receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of a web document and creating in the web browser a virtual page from the web document, wherein the font attribute, within the virtual page, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion in fig. 4, fig. B, paragraphs (0049) - (0054), and (0067). Imielinski teaches in paragraph (0040) that the transformation rules may be applied to the original electronic document, a second electronic document having a similar structure as the original electronic document, or all future instances of the original electronic document. Therefore, Imielinski teaches that a future instance of the original electronic document is the second web document and the virtual page is then the third web document.

**Regarding dependent claims 6 and 52:**

Imielinski does not teach receiving a request to display page break indicators within a web document, identifying page break information for the web document for an output device, and creating in the web browser a fourth web document from the third web document wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the fourth web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks. Imielinski teaches in paragraph (0040) that the transformation rules may be applied to the original electronic document, a second electronic document having a similar structure as the original electronic document, or all future instances of

Art Unit: 2176

the original electronic document. Therefore, Imielinski teaches that a future instance of the original electronic document is the third web document and the virtual page is then the fourth web document.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding **dependent claim 7**:

Imielinski does not teach receiving a request to display page break indicators within a web document, identifying page break information for the web document for an output device, and creating in the web browser a fourth web document from the third web document wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the

Art Unit: 2176

fourth web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks. Imielinski teaches in paragraph (0040) that the transformation rules may be applied to the original electronic document, a second electronic document having a similar structure as the original electronic document, or all future instances of the original electronic document. Therefore, Imielinski teaches that a future instance of the original electronic document is the second web document and the virtual page is then the third web document.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding **dependent claim 9**:

Imielinski teaches wherein the formatting information includes tags in fig. 1-3 and paragraph (0036) – (0048).

Regarding **dependent claim 10**:

Imielinski teaches wherein the markup language is hypertext markup language in paragraphs (0011) and (0015).

Regarding **dependent claim 11**:

Imielinski teaches wherein the formatting information includes hypertext markup language tags in paragraphs (0011) and (0015).

Regarding **dependent claim 12**:

Imielinski teaches wherein the formatting information includes a header in (0011) and (0015).

Regarding **dependent claims 17 and 56**:

Imielinski teaches wherein the selected portion is outputted according to the virtual font indicators in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs (00491 - (0054), and (0067).

Imielinski does not teach wherein the output device is a printer.

Art Unit: 2176

Batres does wherein the output device is a printer in the abstract, col. 1 line 62 - col. 2 line 9, and col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

**Regarding dependent claims 25 and 59:**

Imielinski teaches wherein the selected portion is outputted according to the virtual font indicators in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs (0049) - (0054), and (0067). Imielinski does not teach wherein the output device is a printer.

Batres does wherein the output device is a printer in the abstract, col. 1 line 62 - col. 2 line 9, and col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a

user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

**Regarding independent claims 32, 60 and 67:**

Imielinski teaches receiving a first web document in fig. 1 and paragraphs (0036) - (0040). The first web document is called the original electronic document in Imielinski. Imielinski teaches creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the first web document and second web document are markup language documents in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs (0036) - (0040), and paragraphs (0042) - (0048). In Imielinski the second web document is called the virtual page. The virtual page is the requested portion of the original electronic document that selected and customized according to the transformation rules generated by the user. Imielinski does not teach receiving a request to display page break indicators within the first web document, identifying page break information for the first web document for an output device, and inserting at least one virtual page break indicator into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.



It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding **dependent claims 33 and 61**:

Imielinski does not teach removing the at least one virtual page break indicator and printing the second web document.

Batres does teach Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page

Art Unit: 2176

creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding **dependent claims 34 and 62**:

Imielinski does not teach replacing the at least one virtual page break indicator with at least one forced page break and printing the second web document.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding **dependent claims 35 and 63**:

Imielinski teaches sending the second web document to an output device in fig. 3 and paragraphs (0042) - (0048).

Regarding **dependent claim 36**:

Imielinski does not teach wherein the output device is a printer.

Batres does wherein the output device is a printer in the abstract, col. 1 line 62 - col. 2 line 9, and col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention.

It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding **dependent claim 37**:

Imielinski teaches wherein the output device is a display device in fig. 3 and paragraphs (0042) - (0048).

Regarding **dependent claim 39**:

Imielinski teaches virtual tags for implementing formatting in the second web document in fig. 1-3 and paragraph (0036) - (0048). Imielinski does not teach a virtual page break indicator.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20- 46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding **dependent claim 40**:

Imielinski teaches wherein the markup language is hypertext markup language in paragraphs (0011) and (0015).

Regarding **dependent claim 41**:

Imielinski teaches virtual tags for implementing formatting in the second web document in fig. 1-3 and paragraph (0036) - (0048). Imielinski does not teach a virtual page break indicator.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20- 46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding **dependent claim 42**:

Imielinski teaches creating a copy of the first web document and inserting at least one virtual tag into the copy of the first web document in fig. 1-3 and paragraph (0036) - (0048). Imielinski does not teach that the virtual tag is a virtual page break indicator.

Art Unit: 2176

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

**Regarding dependent claim 43:**

Imielinski teaches inserting at least one virtual tag into the first web document to create a second web document in fig. 1-3 and paragraph (0036) - (0048). Imielinski does not teach that the virtual tag is a virtual page break indicator.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and

Art Unit: 2176

content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding **dependent claim 44**:

Imielinski does not teach sending the first web document to a device driver and receiving page break information corresponding to the first web document from the device driver.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators via a device driver to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding **dependent claim 45**:

Imielinski does not teach wherein the device driver is a printer driver.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators via a printer driver to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a



Art Unit: 2176

user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

**Regarding dependent claim 46:**

Imielinski does not teach identifying the location of at least one page break based on page setup information, document formatting information, and document content.

Batres does teach identifying the location of at least one page break based on page setup information, document formatting information, and document content in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

**Regarding independent claims 47, 64, and 68:**

Imielinski teaches receiving a first web document in fig. 1 and paragraphs (0036) - (0040). The first web document is called the original electronic document in Imielinski. Imielinski teaches receiving a request to perform an action, wherein the request to perform an action comprises a request to present a selected portion of the first web document in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs (0036) - (0040), and paragraphs (0042) - (0048). The request and selected portion are defined in the transformation information of Imielinski. Imielinski teaches wherein the request to perform an action comprises a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs (0049) - (0054), and (0067). Imielinski also provides an example in paragraph (0014) that virtual tags, for example, could be used to display text of the original document in a red font on the virtual page. Imielinski teaches creating in the web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs (0036) - (0040), and paragraphs (0042) - (0048). In Imielinski the second web document is called the virtual page. The virtual page is the requested portion of the original electronic document that selected and customized according to the transformation rules generated by the user. Imielinski does not teach wherein the request to perform an action comprises a request to display page break indicators within the first web document.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators via a printer driver to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

**Regarding independent claim 70:**

Imielinski teaches an interface means for allowing a user to interface with a web browser application and a communication means for receiving a first web document from a network in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs (0036) - (0040), and paragraphs (0042) - (0048). The first web document is called the original electronic document in Imielinski. Imielinski teaches a creation and editing means with a mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request to present a selected portion of the first

Art Unit: 2176

web document in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs (0036) - (0040), and paragraphs (0042) - (0048). The request and selected portion are defined in the transformation information of Imielinski. Imielinski teaches identifying formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document and creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs (0036) - (0040), and paragraphs (0042) - (0048). In Imielinski the second web document is called the virtual page. The virtual page is the requested portion of the original electronic document that selected and customized according to the transformation rules generated by the user. Imielinski teaches a creation and editing means with a mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from interface means to change a font attribute of the selected portion of the first web document in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs (0049) - (0054), and (0067). Imielinski also provides an example in paragraph (0014) that virtual tags, for example, could be used to display text of the original document in a red font on the virtual page. Imielinski creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request, wherein the font attribute of the selected portion within the second web document is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs (0036) - (0040), (0042) - (0054), and (0067). In Imielinski, the second web document is called the virtual page.

Art Unit: 2176

The virtual page is the requested portion of the original electronic document that selected and customized according to the transformation rules generated by the user. Imielinski does not teach a creation and editing means with a mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from the interface means to display page break indicators within the first web document, identifies page break information corresponding to the first web document, and creates in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 - col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention.

It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

6. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicants' arguments filed July 24, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

#### **Regarding Imielinski as a priority document:**

Applicants argue that Imielinski may not be used as a priority document arguing that the teachings and suggestions in the Non-Provisional Application are not supported by the Provisional Application. See Remarks/Arguments, pages 14-17.

The Examiner disagrees.

The standard for evaluating whether a preceding Provisional Application properly supports the subject matter relied upon to make a rejection based on a Non-Provisional Application is whether the subject matter meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. See, MPEP, 2136.03(III).

The inquiry is not whether a claim limitation in question is taught expressly in the underlying Provisional Application under a 35 U.S.C. 102 analysis, but whether the

Art Unit: 2176

subject matter cited as prior art is properly supported by the underlying Provisional Application under a 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph analysis. Upon a finding that the subject matter in the Non-Provisional Application is properly supported by the underlying Provisional Application, under the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph analysis, then the subject matter is entitled to the benefit of the earlier filing date. Accordingly, the expression of the subject matter in the Non-Provisional Application is also accorded the benefit of the earlier filing date and citation to the underlying Provisional Application is not necessary.

For the reasons cited below, the Examiner maintains that the teachings and suggestions of Imielinski are fully supported by the underlying Provisional Application.

**Regarding rejections of independent claims 13, 53, and 66:**

**FIRST:** Applicants argue with respect to claim 13 as representative of claims 53 and 56, that Imielinski does not teach or suggest receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document. See, Remarks/Arguments, page 17.

The Examiner disagrees.

All limitations of claim 13 are taught in Imielinski, except that the limitation of a "font attribute" is not expressly taught in the Provisional Application. See, Provisional Application, page 5, line 30 through page 6, line 3.

The Provisional Application discusses modification of the text to color it red in order to draw attention to the text. See, Provisional Application, page 2, lines 27-29.

Art Unit: 2176

The Provisional Application is expressly not limited to the disclosed embodiments, and it is recognized that other arrangements can be readily devised by those skilled in the art.

Modification of the font attribute is expressly taught in Imielinski. See, Imielinski, fig. 9B, paragraph (0049) [Table 1], paragraph (0067) – (0068), and claims 6, 41, and 74.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the font in a text. The suggestion or motivation for doing so is taught in the Provisional Application that the tags can be “visualized on the source web page,” with the obvious and beneficial advantage to changing text color or font being to draw the reader’s attention to the text.

**SECOND:** Applicants argue that Imielinski does not teach or suggest creating a second web document in the web browser from the first web document, wherein the font attribute, within the second web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion. See, Remarks/Arguments, page 17.

The Examiner disagrees.

Imielinski teaches creating a virtual page or second web document from a first web document using virtual tags. The virtual tags identify the original document content or a selected portion of the original document content for creation of the virtual page. The virtual tags have the ability to manipulate the formatting information, such as font attribute information, in the subsequent web document, called a virtual page by Imielinski.



**Regarding rejections of dependent claims 14, 22, 54, and 57:**

Applicants argue that Imielinski does not teach the step of creating the second web document includes inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion. See, Remarks/Arguments, page 18.

The Examiner disagrees.

Imielinski discloses wherein the step of creating the second web document includes inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs (0049) - (0054), and (0067). Imielinski also provides an example in paragraph (0014) that virtual tags, for example, could be used to display the selected text of the original document in a red font on the virtual page. Note also Imielinski, paragraph [0049], Table 1, elements 1 and 2 defining what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be font characteristics of Bold and Italic start and end tags. Further teachings regarding the use of start and end tags is the reference in Paragraph [0051] to use of the invention in XML, which was known by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to require start and end tags.

Imielinski also discloses identifying at least one font indicator associated with text within the selected portion of the first web document, wherein the step of creating the second web document includes modifying the font attribute of the associated at least one font indicator in fig. 9B and paragraph (0067).

Art Unit: 2176

**Regarding rejections of dependent claims 16, 24, 55, and 58:**

Applicants argue that Imielinski does not teach the selected portion being displayed according to the virtual font indicators. See, Remarks/Arguments, page 18.

The Examiner disagrees.

Imielinski discloses wherein the output device is a display device in fig. 3 and paragraphs (0042) - (0048). Imielinski discloses wherein the selected portion is displayed according to the virtual font indicators in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs (0049) - (0054), and (0067).

**Regarding rejections of dependent claim 30:**

Applicants argue that Imielinski does not teach the step of creating the second web document comprises creating a copy of the first web document and changing the font attribute of the selected portion within the copy of the first web document. See, Remarks/Arguments, page 18.

The Examiner disagrees.

Imielinski discloses creating a copy of the first web document and changing the font attribute of the selected portion within the copy of the first web document in fig. 9B and paragraph (0067). The original document appearing on the user's display is copied and changed, which is the copy. The original document, residing on the server, is not changed.

Art Unit: 2176

**Regarding rejections of dependent claim 31:**

Applicants argue that Imielinski does not teach the step of creating the second web document comprises changing the font attribute of the selected portion within the first web document to create the second web document. See, Remarks/Arguments, page 18.

The Examiner disagrees.

Imielinski discloses creating a copy of the first web document and changing the font attribute of the selected portion within the copy of the first web document in fig. 9A and paragraph (0066).

**Regarding rejections of independent claims 1, 48, and 65:**

Applicants argue that Imielinski in combination with Batres does not teach or suggest receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document; and creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the font attribute, within the second web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents, as recited in independent claim 13.

The Examiner disagrees.

Claims 1, 48, or 65 do not specify the argued limitations. The limitations argued are obviously taken from independent claim 13, which is related to independent claims 53 and 56, which have already been addressed above.

Art Unit: 2176

The grounds for rejection of independent claims 1, 48, and 65 are stated above, and are maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS for the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

Art Unit: 2176

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb

  
Heather R. Herndon  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100